

REMARKS**Claims Rejections - 35 USC §103**

Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rappoport (USP 6,828,963 B1) in view of Official Notice.

Claims 4-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rappoport as applied to claim 1 above, and further, in view of "PTC: Siebel Systems and PTC create strategic alliance to leverage enriched information across product development, sales and service; Combination of Siebel eBusiness Applications and PTC Collaborative Product Development solutions to deliver competitive advantage"; M2 Presswire; Coventry; Jan 24, 2002 and hereafter referred to as "PTC".

Claims 1, 2, and 9

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappoport (USP 6,828,963 B1) in view of Official Notice. It is respectfully submitted that Rappoport is inappropriately cited as prior art because Rappoport discloses exporting and importing of CAD models that has nothing to do with product management applications. The Office Action states that "CAD models and associated information systems...are synonymous with a product and product information systems." It is respectfully submitted that CAD models are not at all synonymous with the product applications for managing product life-cycles.

The Office Action further states "the Examiner takes Official Notice, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have [sic] extended the method and medium of Rappoport with a naming convention of product management system." It is respectfully submitted that it is inappropriate for the Examiner to take Official Notice without documentary evidence where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of

instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well known. As noted by the court in *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970), the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the examiner must be "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute" (citing *In re Knapp Monarch Co.*, 296 F.2d 230, 132 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1961)). The official notice as stated in the Office Action is not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well known. MPEP 2144.03(C) provides that "if the Applicant challenges a factual assertion as not properly Officially Noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge, the Examiner must support the finding with adequate evidence." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner provide adequate evidence to support his finding.

Claims 1, 2, and 9 are canceled by this amendment.

Claims 22 and 23

As for new independent Claims 22 and 23, neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest any of the features of Claims 22 and 23. For example, neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest obtaining new or modified product definitions and requirements. Neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest transforming the new or modified product definitions and requirements using a product common object model. Neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest communicating the transformed the new or modified product definitions to target applications. Neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest a target application that causes the creation of a new product or modifies an existing product. Neither Rappoport nor PTC disclose or suggest creating new data records or updating existing data records in the target format based on the transformed new or modified product definitions and requirements in the product common object model.

Claims 4-10, 12-16

Claims 4-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rappoport, and further in view of PTC. As previously mentioned, Claim 9 is cancelled in this amendment. Claim 10 is also cancelled in this amendment.

Claims 4-8, and 12-16 depend either directly or indirectly on an allowable base claim such as Claim 22 or Claim 23 and thus are allowable for at least that reason. Further, Claims 4-8, and 12-16 include features that independently render them allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, the rejection of claims as stated in the office action dated August 2, 2005 should be withdrawn, and applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2207, under Order No. 384818045US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

November 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Carina M. Tan

Registration No.: 45,769
PERKINS COIE LLP
Customer Number 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, WA 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
Attorney for Applicant